

BEFORE THE  
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON DC 20268-0001

RECEIVED

JAN 17 4 16 PM '02

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Postal Rate and Fee Changes, 2001

Docket No. R2001-1

DAVID B. POPKIN MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORIES  
DBP/USPS-140 and 139  
January 17, 2002

I move to compel response to the interrogatories submitted to the United States Postal Service that were objected to by them.

Respectfully submitted,

January 17, 2002

David B. Popkin, PO Box 528, Englewood, NJ 07631-0528

---

DBP/USPS-140 This interrogatory is attempting to obtain information regarding the costs for transporting Priority Mail and that the costs for transportation are somewhat distance related even though the Postal Service may not be paying for them that way. Transporting mail through the FedEx hub at Memphis does add to the cost of transporting the mail because of the added distances involved [although the overall costs hopefully are less because of the efficiencies of the entire system]. Therefore, this interrogatory is relevant to the costs of transporting Priority Mail.

DBP/USPS-139 The underlying interrogatory DBP/USPS-74 asked for the reasons and significance of the reasons for changing Express Mail from a zoned to an unzoned rate basis. The obvious reason for asking this was to determine if any of these reasons would apply in reverse to the changing of the Priority Mail from an unzoned to a zoned rate base for the 2 to 5 pound categories. The response to DBP/USPS-74 referred me to a page number in the Opinion filed in Docket R84-1. As a follow-up to that with DBP/USPS-92, I asked for a clarification as to the specific lines on that page that were responsive to my original question. Once I was provided with a specific response to my original interrogatory, I then followed-up on that by asking specific questions that

paraphrased each of the advantages of the Express Mail change to see how they applied to the proposed Priority Mail change. This is certainly a proper follow-up to clarify or elaborate on the original response to subpart c of DBP/USPS-74 through its intermediate clarifying interrogatory DBP/USPS-92. The statement that the interrogatories could have been posed at any time is irrelevant; any interrogatory could be asked at any time and whether it is needed to clarify or elaborate on a response is the key question.

The reference to it not hinging on the three-word paragraph citation seems to be totally inappropriate. That would seem to me to Move to Compel any response that is made which refers to a previous response or reference because any potential follow-up certainly will not be needed to clarify or elaborate on the specific reference citation words themselves but on the underlying information contained in the reference.

For the reasons stated, I move to compel responses to the referenced interrogatories.

---

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon the required participants of record in accordance with Rule 12.

January 17, 2002

David B. Popkin